

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 10-11, 18-20, 23-24, and 29; claims 32-34 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-31 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The Applicant has canceled claims 32-34 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 11, 19, 20, 23, 24, 29 and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pelletier, et al. (US 6,411,704). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims.

The Pelletier reference discloses a first network where a call comes in at a switch and the switch invokes a first network Switching Control Point (SCP). The first network SCP obtains information for executing a pre-selection service and instructs the first network switch to reroute the call to a second network (a carrier network).

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Pelletier reference (see col. 5, lines 21-28) teaches against the Applicant's invention. The Applicant's present invention discloses a first network where a call comes in to a switch and the switch interrogates a register (the HLR or the special number register). The switch then forwards the call to a switch in the second network and invokes a second network SCP that executes the service. If the service is carrier pre-selected then the second network SCP instructs the second network switch to forward the call to the carrier network. The advantage of this method is that there is no need for an SCP in the first network. The problem that a specific service must be known in the first network SCP is avoided.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 2-10, 12-18, 21, 22, 25-28, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelletier, et al. (US 6,411,704). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Examiner states that the dependent claims do not contain additional features that, when combined with the claims from which they depend, “rise to a level of patentability since these additional features concern obvious design choices and/or suggested by Pelletier.” The Applicant notes that the Examiner’s statement appears to be a blanket statement covering all the rejected dependent claims. The Applicant contends that “design choice” is not a grounds for rejection under 35 USC §103. Design choices are discussed in the MPEP § 2104.04 but, the design choices discussed in the MPEP are in relation to a rearrangement of parts. The Pelletier reference can not be applied to the Applicant’s claims as a “rearrangement of parts” since the Pelletier reference does not disclose all of the parts disclosed in the Applicant’s claims.

For example, in the Applicant’s claim 2, the Pelletier reference does not disclose the use of an indexing register that indicates the type of value added service associated with the forwarding number. In at least claims 2-3 and 14-15, the present invention discloses the use of an indexing register, a part that is not disclosed in the Pelletier reference. The Applicant submits this is only one instance where Pelletier fails to disclose or suggest additional features. Even so, the Applicant contends that the “design choice” does not apply to the dependent claims. This being the case, the Applicant contends that the Pelletier reference does not disclose all the limitations or elements of the rejected claims and respectfully requests the allowance of dependent claims 2-10, 12-18, 21, 22, 25-28, 30 and 31

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sidney L. Weatherford/

By Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: September 20, 2011

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656